

Remarks

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1-34 are pending. Claim 26 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 33-34 have been added. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Rosen (US 6,122,625).

Claims 2-25 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rosen in view of Tedesco (US 6,282,523).

Rosen does not anticipate the claims

Rosen is not directed to depositing a deposit *item* into a deposit accepting *machine*, nor receiving depositor input (including deposit item data) via *remote* communication through an input device in operative connection with *the* machine.

Rosen is directed to "electronic" money. With regard to depositing tangible "paper" money, Rosen at best teaches a conventional deposit at a bank (either an Issuing Bank at col. 30, lines 51-52 or col. 31, lines 7-8; or a Correspondent Bank at col. 31, lines 25-26 and 54-55) via a bank teller (e.g., col. 8, lines 25-31; col. 32, lines 19-20).

The applied references do not render the claims obvious

The Action (at page 3, paragraph number 8) alleges that Rosen teaches that an "input device comprises a reader device to read a tag" and that the "tag comprises deposit data". Unfortunately, the record is silent as to where Rosen teaches the alleged subject matter. It appears that Rosen does once mention a "tag" at col. 35, line 60. Rosen states that "Additionally, transitions to steps in another figure are indicated by a pentagonal *tag* having an alphanumeric symbol, and continue on the other figure with a circle having the same alphanumeric symbol therein." Is this the "tag" that "comprises deposit data" the Office is relying on?

Tedesco, at the section (col. 4, lines 26-65) relied upon by the Office, teaches that a bank computer (12) comprises a processor (20) that can be in communication with a bank data storage device (22) by a remote communication link such as a radio frequency transceiver. It is unclear what the relied upon teaching of Tedesco has to do with the relied upon "tag" of Rosen or with the claimed subject matter. Rosen in view of Tedesco does not render the claims obvious. It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Rosen with the teaching of Tedesco as alleged to have produced the recited invention.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application by phone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Locke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000
Customer No. 28995